

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/042,612	01/09/2002	Matthew I. Egbe	5669	7021
759	03/24/2004		EXAMINER	
Martin Connaughton Ashland Inc.			KORNAKOV, MICHAIL	
P.O. Box 2219	•		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Columbus, OH 43216			1746	

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			/ I A
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<i>-11</i> t
	10/042,612	EGBE ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Kornakov	1746	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address	•
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state than the set of the maximum statutory perions. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state than three months after the maximum state of the maximum state. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state than three months after the maximum state of the maximum state. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state than the maximum state of the maximum state.	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of the od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC tute, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed inty (30) days will be considered timely. DNTHS from the mailing date of this communicat ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	tion.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17	February 2004.		
<u> </u>	his action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	· ()	· •	is
closed in accordance with the practice unde	r <i>Ex par</i> te Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5,13 and 14 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5, 13 and 14 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction. 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	ccepted or b) objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyone oction is required if the drawing	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ents have been received. ents have been received in riority documents have bee eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) D Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview	Summary (PTO-413)	
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-992) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/C Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No	o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 1746

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

- 1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after allowance or after an Office action under *Ex Parte Quayle*, 25 USPQ 74, 453 O.G. 213 (Comm'r Pat. 1935). Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on February 17, 2004 has been entered.
- 2. Applicants amended claim 1 to introduce the limitation of water soluble organic solvent range of 30-90 wt.% versus 80-90 wt%, as appeared in the previously allowed claims. Applicants submitted that previous amendment setting forth the range of 80-90 wt.% was "an obvious typographical error". However, the reasons for allowance clearly indicates that it is the amendment to the range that distinguished the present claims from the prior art, and that the range as appeared in the amended claims was the major reason for allowance. New claims 13 and 14 are added. Claims 6 and 7 are cancelled. Claims 8-12 stand withdrawn from consideration, as being drawn to non-elected invention.
- 3. Claims 1-5 and 13, 14 are examined on the merits.
- 4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office actions.

Page 2

Art Unit: 1746

5. Claims 1-5, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by or in the alternative as obvious over Inoue et al (U.S. 6,232,283).

Inoue teaches a liquid detergent composition comprising 30% of monoethanolamine (col.3, lines 35, 60-65 and col.10, line 62), strait chain alkylbenzene sulfonic acid with C8-C22 carbons (reads on dodecylbenzene sulfonic acid) in the amount of 1-30% (col.12, line 60, col.2, line 42, col.10, lines 60-65), and at least 40% of water (col.10, lines 63-65, and Tables 1 and 2). This reads on the limitations of claims 1, 3 and 4. With regard to claims 2, 5 and 13, 14 Inoue teaches the presence of malonic acid (col.3, line 45), which can be introduced in the amount of 0.01-30% (col. 1, line 61). Malonic acid of Inoue acts as a corrosion inhibitor, since it is the compound used by Applicants as corrosion inhibitor. Therefore, the composition as claimed can be envisaged by one of an ordinary skill in the art.

In the event that one of the ordinary skill in the art would not immediately envisage Applicants' instantly claimed composition, then the composition is rendered obvious from the disclosure found in the prior art reference to Inoue. The prior art contains each of Applicants' instantly claimed ingredients and clearly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art that they be used in combination as claimed. Such a suggestion renders obvious Applicants' instantly claimed composition, and as such, the claims are not patentable.

6. Claims 1-5, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Jones (U.S. 4,199,483).

Art Unit: 1746

Jones discloses a detergent cleaning composition (abstract), comprising from 20-75%, preferably 30-60% of water soluble detergent surfactant (col.2, lines 5-10), which is preferably monoethanolamine (col.6, lines 35-40). This is component (A) of the instant claim 1 and further a component identified in the instant claim 2. Another component of Jones is a salt of an alkylbenzene sulfonic acid, wherein the alkyl group contains C9-C15 (col.5, lines 60-65). This reads on dodecylbenzene sulfonic acid. The composition of Jones contains 1-75% of water (col.7, lines 40-45).

The mixture of alkanolamine and alkali metal salt of alkylbenzene sulfonic acid is a preferred surfactant system in Jones (col.6, lines 32-37). This mixture is utilized in the amount of 20-75% of the composition. Such teaching allows to those skilled in the art clearly envisage the claimed components in the ranges as instantly claimed. With regard to claims 13 and 14 Jones utilizes corrosion inhibitor in the amounts of 1-3% by weight (col.6, lines 50-55). With specific regard to claim 5, Jones utilizes benzotriazole in his corrosion inhibiting composition (col.9, line 30). Therefore, the composition of the instant claims is anticipated by Jones.

In the event that one of the ordinary skill in the art would not immediately envisage Applicants' instantly claimed composition, then the composition is rendered obvious from the disclosure found in the prior art reference to Jones. The Jones Patent contains each of Applicants' instantly claimed ingredients and clearly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art that they be used in combination as claimed. Such a suggestion renders obvious Applicants' instantly claimed composition, and as such, the claims are not patentable.

Art Unit: 1746

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 02/17/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Relative to Jones reference ('483 Patent): Applicants arguments reside in contention that the examples of Jones show 30.2 wt.% of an alkylbenzene sulfonic acid, and the amount of alcohol and alkanolamine of 9.5%. Applicants further state that such ranges are outside Applicants claimed ranges. In response to this Applicants attention is drawn to a generic teaching of Jones who provides for 20-75% of combined detergent surfactant (col.2, lines 5 and 6), wherein the preferable composition of such detergent surfactant is a mixture of mono-di or triethanolamine with alkali metal salt of benzene sulfonic acid (col.6, lines 30-40). Applicants are advised that disclosed examples and preferred embodiments do not constitute a teaching away from a broader disclosure or non-preferred embodiments, consult *In re Susi*, 440 F.2d 442, 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971). A reference may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill the art, including non-preferred embodiments, consult Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 975 (1989). See also Celeritas Technologies Ltd. v. Rockwell International Corp., 150 F.3d 1354, 1361, 47 USPQ2d 1516, 1522-23 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

Relative to Inoue ('283 patent): The crux of Applicant's arguments is that Inoue does not disclose all of the required elements of Applicants claimed invention that fall within

Art Unit: 1746

the same weight percentage ranges. This is not found persuasive, since Inoue teaches a liquid detergent composition comprising 30% of monoethanolamine (col.3, lines 35 and 60-65 and col.10, line 62), strait chain alkylbenzne sulfonic acid with C8-C22 carbons (reads on dodecylbenzene sulfonic acid) in the amount of 0.01-30% (col.1, lines 55-60, col.2, line 36, and 42, col.12, line 60, col.10, lines 60-65), and at least 40% of water (col.10, lines 63-65, and Tables 1 and 2), which is identical to the instantly claimed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Kornakov whose telephone number is (571) 272-1303. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on (571) 272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 1746

M. COPNAKON 3/19/04 Michael Kornakov Examiner

Art Unit 1746

Page 7